UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,109	11/03/2000	Scott Nedderman	3553-4074US3	9251

27123 7590 06/06/2005

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101

EXAMINER	
KANG, INSUN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2193	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/708,109	NEDDERMAN, SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Insun Kang	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-104* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-104* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

RD

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application papers dated 12/16/2004.

2. Claims 1-104 are pending in the application.

Specification

3. The use of the trademark JAVA (i.e. specification page 11), UNIX (i.e. specification page 2) and ACTIVEX (i.e. specification page 11) has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

*Note: the applicant stated that the applicant is "unaware of any suitable generic terms for the trademarks used." The examiner provides several exemplary pages for the applicant's reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The rejections to claims 3-6, 9-12, 15-18, 21-24, 26-29, 31-34, 36-39, 41-44, 46, 52, 48-50, 54-56, 58,60-62, 64, 66-68, 70-74,76-80, 82-86, 88-92, 94,95, 97, 98, 100,101, 103 have been withdrawn due to the amendments to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US Patent 6,535,883) herein after referred to as "Lee."

Per claim 1:

Lee discloses:

-receiving information over a communications network ("server computer...confirming data input by a user of the mobile computer," col. 4 lines 5-25)

retrieving validation rules from a rules library stored in a memory device and determining computer data validity by applying the retrieved validation rules to the information ("In order to ensure the validity of the data entered by the worker, some or all of the fields will have an associated validation rule... for performing one or more tests or comparisons on data in one or more fields to make sure the data is valid...The validation rules are loaded ...and validation rules associated with fields in the rules file are associated ...with the corresponding field names in the MPA. The validation rules test the contents of each field entered by the user to ensure that the field is filled out correctly," col. 2 lines 24-40) as claimed.

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses highlighting information determined to be invalid by the validation rules (see Fig 14) as claimed.

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a client ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("a set of validation rules for validating data entries made to service provider forms," col. 4 lines 28-41) as claimed.

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claims 7-12, they are the system versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claims 13-18, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claims 19-24, they are the apparatus versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claim 25:

Lee discloses identifying data types requiring validation and providing validation rules stored in a memory device for the associated data types from a rules library ("Sets of

validation rules are created for a form interactively, by selecting fields, adding appropriate validation rules to be implemented for the fields, and adding appropriate expressions for the validation rules," col. 3 lines 19-40) as claimed.

Per claim 26:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a client ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 27:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are provided to a server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 28:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("a set of validation rules for validating data entries made to service provider forms," col. 4 lines 28-41) as claimed.

Per claim 29:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claims 30-34, they are the system versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claims 35-39, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claims 40-44, they are the apparatus versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claim 45

Lee discloses:

-providing a rules library and an initial parent rule stored in a memory device (The menu presents the expressions as expression templates, which are templates for creating and completing an expression," col. 3 lines 40-54)

- building validation rules by subclassing members of a rules library class hierarchy. ("allows a user to create a validation rule by selecting a template and fill in the blacks," col. 3 lines 50-54) as claimed.

Per claim 46:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses storing subclassed validation rules in the rule library ("enables a user to create a set of form validation rules...Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file," col. Lines 29-41) as claimed.

Per claim 47:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the subclassed validation rules inherit validation logic from a parent rule (col. 6 lines 54-67) as claimed.

Per claim 48:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are associated with data types (Table 2, col. 11 lines 31-60) as claimed.

Per claim 49:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("receiving data including the input data from the form submitted to a server," col. 2 lines 33-40) ("it is determined whether the input data is valid using information stored in the registry," col. 2 lines 33-44)

Per claim 50:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claims 51-56, they are the system versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claims 57-62, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claims 63-68, they are the apparatus versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

7. Claims 69-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Strong (US Patent 6,167,523).

Per claim 69:

Strong discloses:

-marking data types for associated validation rules from a rules library stored in a

memory device and providing validation marked data types ("The data...from the form...includes the first registry key identifier...following the FORM declaration...Once the data...is received, the form data validation and processing program...controls data validation, error reporting and processing of the input data," col. 7 lines 5-30) as claimed.

Per claim 70:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses:

- building forms with the validation rules associated with marked data types ("The data...from the form...includes the first registry key identifier...following the FORM declaration...Once the data...is received, the form data validation and processing program...controls data validation, error reporting and processing of the input data," col. 7 lines 5-30) as claimed.

Per claim 71:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses storing forms with the validation rules associated with marked data types ("the forms data validation and processing control program is stored on the Web server," col. 4 lines 62-67; "The program uses information stored in the registry to determine whether the input data from the form is valid," abstract) as claimed.

Per claim 72:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses providing forms with the validation rules associated with marked data types over a communications network ("the forms data validation and processing control program is stored on the Web server," col. 4 lines 62-67) as claimed.

Per claim 73:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses that the validation rules are imbedded into a web page("the forms data validation and processing control program is stored on the Web server," col. 4 lines 62-67) as claimed.

Per claim 74:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server (col. 5 lines 62-67 and col 6. 1-15) as claimed.

Per claims 75-80, they are the system versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claims 81-86, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claims 87-92, they are the apparatus versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claim 93:

Strong discloses:

-identifying browser capability, choosing a validation deployment ("Handlers ...act as "plug-in" modules that can be added to perform any variety of processing tasks...In this manner, data processing support can be easily customized, " col. 10, lines 60-67 and col. 11 lines 1-5) determining if a browser supports regular expressions, and if so, providing validation rules to a client determining if the browser supports non regular expression language, and if so, providing non regular expression language information validation; determining if the browser does not support non regular expression language, and if not, providing regex enabled validation on a server ("The handlers 260 associated with HTML forms to be processed, and the registry 270 including registry keys and subkeys 275 storing configuration and validation information specific to forms to be processed are also stored on the Web Server," col 5 lines 60-67; "The handlers ...may include one or more different handlers for each of the HTML forms 245 that may be accessed by the client PC 200 or another software or hardware client...the handlers 260 may include a different handler for each type of data to be processed," col 5. lines 46-53)

-providing the browser with appropriate network location and the validation rules; obtaining information from a user("The data...from the form...includes the first registry key identifier...following the FORM declaration...Once the data...is received, the form

data validation and processing program...controls data validation, error reporting and processing of the input data," col. 7 lines 5-30)

-validating information with appropriate validation rules stored in a memory device storing configuration and validation information specific to forms to be processed are also stored on the Web Server," col 5 lines 60-67) as claimed.

Per claim 94:

The rejection of claim 93 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses that validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("the forms data validation and processing control program is stored on the Web server," col. 4 lines 62-67) as claimed.

Per claim 95:

The rejection of claim 93 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses that the validation rules are executable both on a client and server (col. 5 lines 62-67 and col 6. 1-15) as claimed.

Per claims 96-98, they are the system versions of claims 93-95, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 93-95 above.

Per claims 99-101, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 93-95, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 93-95 above.

Per claims 102-104, they are the apparatus versions of claims 93-95, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 93-95 above.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 12/16/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Per claims 1-92:

The Applicant states that a template in the cited prior art is different from the rules library as the "template may not be subclassed or take on different characteristics from its parent as may be achieved with rules from parents from entries in the rules library (remark, 18)."

In response to applicant's argument that the reference fails to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., subclassed or take on different characteristics from its parent as may be achieved with rules from parents from entries in the rules library) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As such, the claims are read with the broadest reasonable interpretation in mind (Note MPEP 2111).

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-92 is considered proper and maintained.

Per claims 93-104:

The applicant states that the cited reference does not disclose regular expressions.

In response, Strong discloses the "forms data validation and processing control program 255 is a CGI executable written in C/C++ such that the program 255 runs native on a variety of different platforms...and the handlers 260 are implemented as Windows dynamic link libraries (DLLs)," col. 5 lines 40-57)." As the applicant admits, C++, ActiveX, CGI scripts etc have regular expression (regex) abilities (specification, page 11-12), and also the regular expression engine is built into the DLLs. If applicant means anything more, this must be brought out in the claims to further clarify the invention. Therefore, the rejection of claims 93-104 is considered proper and maintained.

Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Insun Kang whose telephone number is 571-272-3724. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on 571-272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

I. Kang
Examiner
5/25/2005

TODD INGBERG
PRIMARY EXAMINER